shell has become attached to the surface of some marine body, for the protection of its siphons, and, like the usual part of the valves, the tube is coloured and covered with a thin periostracum.

The two specimens in Mr. Cuming's collection are very different in external appearance. In the larger one (figured in the 'Proceedings,' 1852, Moll. pl. 15. f. 5) the valves after they become united are expanded considerably, forming a large irregular-shaped shield; and then they extend suddenly behind into a tube which is separated from the shield by an impressed line and the front bag-like projection filling up the gap between the front of the valves, which is irregularly wrinkled and scattered with small rather prominent perforations, evidently formed for the protection of the cylindrical tentacles on the surface of the mantle; and the edge of the expanded part of the base, by which it is attached to the shell on which it lived, is furnished with similar projecting perforations, often placed in pairs. The entire shell is covered with a thin periostracum. The posterior tubular part of the shell is marked with a succession of rings, showing the periodical interruption in its growth, the prominent longitudinal lines on its outer surface being continued from one to the other, showing that the siphons of the animal must be constantly becoming longer and longer as the animal grows, and is marked also by four equidistant prominences on its edge, which give the tube its regular subquadrangular appearance.

In the smaller specimen, which was attached to a stone, the small valves, as soon as they were united, seem to have expanded behind and on the sides into a continuous subquadrangular tube, with scarcely any projection in front of the valves; there is a small tube arising in front and behind the dorsal edge of the valves, and curled over their back. There are only a few tubular projections on the left side of the attached part of the shell, instead of the number found on the front and sides of the other specimens.

In both the specimens the interior surface of the cavity is quite smooth and continuous, and entirely destitute of the definite line which defines the form of the proper valves of the shell, and separates them from the tube, which is always so distinctly marked in the *Aspergilla*.

The valves of the young shell appear to be rather unequal in size; that is to say, the apex of the right valves in both the species is situated rather under that of the left, as if the right valve were rather the flattest and smallest; but the difference is not very defined.

7. Note on the Eggs of the Frigate Bird and Crocodile of Jamaica. By E. Cavendish Taylor, M.A.

The eggs of the Frigate Bird (*Fregata aquila*), which I now exhibit, were taken by my brother, Mr. J. C. Taylor, on the 1st of January 1858, at Fonseca Bay, on the Pacific coast of the Republic of Honduras. They are of a pure white colour, and measure $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches in length by $1\frac{3}{4}$ in breadth.

Although the species of *Fregata* are not as yet very accurately determined, it is believed that the same species (*Fregata aquila*) is found on both the Pacific and Atlantic shores of Central America.

The eggs of the Crocodile of Jamaica (*Crocodilus acutus*) were also obtained by my brother early in the present year, on that island. They present the elongated oval form peculiar to the Crocodilians. They are of a shining white colour, and measure $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in length by 2 inches in breadth.

8. On Charadella and Lichenella, new forms of Polyzoa from Australia. By Dr. J. E. Gray.

The first coral which I wish to bring before the Meeting is nearly allied to the genus *Amathia*—indeed some naturalists may be inclined to regard it only as a section of that genus; but as it presents a different mode of growth and habit, I think it is desirable that it should be distinguished by a distinctive name.

I may premise that the name of the larger group to which it belongs is the subject of a very unpleasant discussion. Lamouroux and Lamarck both published the genus in the year 1812 under two different names, the first calling it *Amathia* and the second *Serialia*, as is also the case with many other genera established in the same works.

There can be no doubt that these authors studied their subject, and found out what they considered natural groups, and named them, independently. Lamouroux presented his memoir on the subject to the Institute in 1810, and Lamarck was named one of the Commissioners to report on his paper; so that he had the opportunity of knowing what Lamouroux had done two years before the publication of his own work; and this has given rise to Lamarck being charged with pirating the labours of Lamouroux.

But I think any one who has known anything of the character of Lamarck must consider such a charge as groundless; and I merely cite this as an instance of the very unpleasant position in which a naturalist is placed by being called upon to examine and adjudicate on an unpublished paper of another author engaged on the same branch of study; and an opinion on such a subject by one not so engaged is generally worse than useless. I consider this one of the great objections to the system of reference which is so commonly adopted in this country, France, and America.

In France and America they do their best to obviate the evil, by making the names of the referees public, and requiring them to send in a written report, while here the referee is often only known to the officers of the society. Neither system obviates the evil which laid Lamarck open to the unpleasant, and, I believe, ungrounded charge, which has been brought against him, and which may be made against any scientific man who is called upon to read the MSS. communication of another labourer in the same field of study.

Lamouroux named one of the species of *Amathia*, *cornuta*,